

REMARKS

The Office Action of January 5, 2005 has been carefully considered. In response thereto, the claims have been amended as set forth above. Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Various ones of the claims were rejected for various informalities. These have been addressed by the present amendment.

Claims 1-3, 5-11 and 13-15 were rejected as being anticipated by White. Claim 15 has been cancelled. Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to more clearly distinguish over the cited reference.

In particular, the claims have been amended to make clear that the execution units (at least some of the execution units) operate under both global and local control, including local control of a number of repetitions of execution of a functional unit. No such arrangement is believed to be taught or suggested by White.

In White, the "control unit" (reservations stations) do not control of a number of repetitions of execution of a functional unit.


With respect to claim 3, which was previously presented, the rejection describes "FIFO...register means adapted for supporting data-flow communication among said functional units [285 of Figure 2A, the Reorder Buffer is a FIFO register...device which is utilized by all of the functional units to support data-flow...."

Applicant respectfully disagrees. There is no indication in White that the Reorder Buffer of White is a FIFO register. Typically, the Reorder Buffer of White would not be expected to be realized using a FIFO register.

Accordingly, the claims as amended are believed to patentably define over White.

Withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 1-3, 5-11,13 and 14 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. Ure, Reg. 33,089

Dated: February 8, 2005